



# Basic and Applied Research (IJSBAR)

**ISSN 2307-4531**  
**(Print & Online)**

<http://gssrr.org/index.php?journal=JournalOfBasicAndApplied>




---

## Approaches in Teaching Writing Designed by High School English Teachers in Indonesia

Budi Setyono\*

*<sup>a</sup> The Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, The University of Jember,  
Jl. Kalimantan 37, Jember 68121, Indonesia  
<sup>a</sup>Email: [bssetyono@gmail.com](mailto:bssetyono@gmail.com)*

### Abstract

The present study focused on investigating EFL writing instruction in Indonesia due to the unavailability of previous researches focusing on writing instruction in EFL context. Most of research studies on EFL/ESL writing instruction were carried out at the university level. The present study was intended to describe approaches in teaching writing by high school English teachers in Indonesia in the early implementation of the competence-based curriculum. The present study applied qualitative research using the design of multi-case study. Data on approaches in teaching writing were collected from three high school English teachers piloting the implementation of the competence-based curriculum. In the qualitative study, the main instrument to collect data was the researcher himself by conducting documentary study, interview with the English teachers, and observation in the classroom. Data were analyzed in the following procedures, i.e. writing raw data in the written-up fieldnotes, coding the fieldnotes, writing summary, creating matrices, and drawing conclusion. Approaches in teaching writing by the English teachers were inferred from learning experiences and writing assessment designed by the teachers. The characteristics of teaching writing in the process and product approach were used as the parameter in describing teachers' approaches in the teaching of writing. The findings revealed that in teaching writing three high school English teachers tended to apply product-based approach characterized by the linear model of instruction. In line with the product approach, the teachers also applied product assessment in assessing the achievement of writing and to provide students' writing feedback.

**Keywords:** approaches; teaching writing; high school, EFL context

---

\*Corresponding author: Telp. +62 331 085746544994  
e-mail address: [bssetyono@gmail.com](mailto:bssetyono@gmail.com)

## **1. Introduction**

In the context of English Language Teaching (ELT) in Indonesian secondary schools, the attainment of communicative competence has become the goal of ELT since the 1984 English curriculum. At the level of philosophy, the competence-based curriculum still adopts the theory of language as a means of communication. Consequently, the goal of language teaching in Indonesian secondary schools is directed towards the students' attainment of communicative competence, consisting of grammatical competence, sociolinguistic competence, discourse competence, and strategic competence [1,2]. In ELT the term 'communicative competence' must be used as the foundation to develop models of language teaching and its evaluation system [3].

The attainment of communicative competence is facilitated through oral and written communication known as the four language skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing). Listening and reading are categorized as the receptive skill, whereas speaking and writing are categorized as the productive skill. The attainment of communicative competence is indicated by mastery of the four language skills having been formulated in the forms of standard competence and basic competences.

In the teaching of English in high school, the adequacy of teachers' knowledge on the methodology of ELT using communicative approach is absolutely important. Principally, in teaching English using communicative approach, the teachers are required to follow the communicative principles as follows: (1) language is viewed as a means of expressing meanings that are realized through structure and vocabulary, (2) meanings are determined through contexts related to situations, (3) learning language means learning to use language through communicative activities in the target language (written and spoken, productive and receptive), (4) mastery of structure and vocabulary needed to support mastery of the language skills, and (5) the teaching of structure and vocabulary can be focused if the teacher feels it necessary [4].

Referring to the principles above, the teachers can use various techniques in teaching English as long as it is relevant with those principles. In the teaching of writing skill, teachers of English minimally need to recognize two essential approaches in teaching L2 writing, i.e. product-based approach and process-oriented approach. In developing learner writers, product-based approach prioritizes the formation of learners' language ability, and later if students have already mastered the basic skill in language, the focus will be shifted to the rhetorical problems [5]. In contrast, process-based approach prioritizes learners' ability in developing and organizing ideas (rhetoric) through the process of prewriting, drafting, revising, editing, and publishing [6,7]. From these two approaches, teachers are expected to be able to identify features, strengths and weaknesses of these approaches. Instead of knowledge on the approaches in teaching writing, ideally the teachers are also recommended to use the research findings as a reference to design and improve their teaching. By doing so, their teaching is based on sound theoretical bases and empirical data.

In relation to the teaching of writing, the process approach in teaching writing has become a trend in ESL contexts as revealed from the previous studies on teaching writing. In ESL context a study by Winer[8] examined the process of changes in the negative behaviors and attitudes of the graduate students towards writing and the teaching

of writing. The findings revealed writing tasks using the process approach could change the students' negative attitudes and behaviors towards writing and the teaching of writing. Peyton, et al. [9] examined teachers implementing writing workshop with ESOL students. In implementing writing workshop, it was found that ESOL teachers were constrained by limited time, space, and resources, as well as conflicts between the approach they are attempting and other school-or district-wide demands. In the classroom they struggle with the dynamics of students writing fluency, conferencing, and sharing, revising, and preoccupations with correctness.

In EFL context, Cahyono [10] examined the students' productivity in writing through the application of thematic writing. This study revealed that thematic writing could improve the students' productivity as indicated by the number of paragraphs, the number of theme-focused writing, development of ideas in supporting paragraphs, and sense of purpose in writing. Another study by Cahyono [11] examined the effectiveness of journal writing. From this study, it was found that journal writing was proved to be the effective one in developing students' proficiency in writing as indicated by the level of significance of means difference in the scores of pretest and posttest.

The previous studies as reviewed above revealed that studies on teaching writing were mostly conducted at the university levels in both ESL and EFL contexts. These indicate that study on teaching writing in ESL/EFL contexts is not yet investigated by the previous researchers. By considering the findings of the previous studies and the feasibility study conducted in two senior high schools in Jember as stated in the previous paragraphs, the present study is feasible to be conducted. The unavailability of empirical data on teaching writing conducted in senior high school in EFL context has given a room to investigate the area of study, whereas the temporary findings about the teaching practice of writing in two senior high schools by the English teachers in Jember give more opportunities to do in-depth investigation for the sake of understanding better about the teaching of writing in the context of teaching English in senior high schools in Indonesian context. An understanding in the teaching of writing in this study will also be unique as the subjects of the study are the English teachers whose schools are instructed to try out the competence-based curriculum.

In reference to the background of the study, two specific research questions that will be answered are (1) How do three high school English teachers design approaches in teaching writing ?, (2) How do they design writing assessment ?. Considering the above questions, this study are intended to describe: (1) approaches designed by three high school English teachers in teaching writing, (2) writing assessment employed by the English teachers..

## **2. Methodology**

In describing writing instruction implemented by three high school English teachers modeling the implementation of the competence-based curriculum, the design of multi-case study was applied. In the multi-case study, data were collected from different subjects, (i.e. three English teachers of high schools) in different research settings, (i.e. three high schools appointed to model the implementation of the competence-based curriculum) [12]. This study employed the following procedures: (1) collect the qualitative data about the teaching of writing in the model schools from documentary study, in-depth interview, and non-participant observation, (2) analyze the data

qualitatively, (3) describe the findings, and (4) evaluate the findings of teaching writing in the model schools on the basis of learning experiences and procedures of teaching writing in the process and product approach. The data to be collected were the learning experiences and writing assessments applied by the English teachers.

The documents to be studied are the written document of competence based curriculum and the course outline of English subject developed by the English Teachers Association (MGMP), Jember. From the documents of curriculum and course outlines developed by the MGMP forum, the writer obtained data about the scope of writing materials required to be covered in the first grade of senior high school and the teachers' global plan and management in teaching writing materials, covering information about themes to be covered, time allocation, media and resources, teaching methods, and assessment technique in teaching writing. Document is analyzed using matrix of document analysis.

In conducting interview with the English teachers, semi-structured interview technique is chosen for the sake of eliciting specific answers from the teachers of English [13]. To interview the English teachers, the writer used interview guide consisting of 15 questions related to the variable of teaching writing. On the basis of teachers' information in the structured interview, then the writer also conducted in-depth interview to obtain detailed and deep understanding about the teaching of writing from the teachers' perspectives. The interview was recorded for the sake of ease in understanding data from the interviewees.

Finally, to crosscheck the results of document analysis and interview, classroom observation was conducted. In conducting classroom observation, the researcher chose the role as non-participant observer meaning that the researcher identifies himself as a researcher with no involvement in the teaching learning process [13]. During the observation, relevant data/ behaviors related the variables of teaching writing were written in the researchers' field-notes. Classroom observation was focused on teaching and learning activities of writing in the stage of prewriting activities, main activities, and closing activities.

Data of the qualitative study have been analyzed since the first round of data collection. Analysis in the field was conducted for the purpose of identifying data that could not be captured during the site visit and identifying more data that need to be collected in the next round of data collection. As there were three model schools determined to be the sites of the study (each school was scheduled to be visited four times during the data collection period), totally there were four rounds of data collection in each school. The process of data analysis adapted from Miles and Huberman [14] can be described in the following. First, raw data in the forms of scribbled fieldnotes resulted from in-depth interview and non-participant observation in each round of data collection were written in the form of written-up fieldnotes (write-up) as soon as returning from the site visit. The second step was *coding* the fieldnotes. In coding the fieldnotes, the research questions were used as a guide in determining the coding category. In reference to the research questions, *strategies* in teaching writing were determined as the *main* category with *sub-categories* of strategy in designing learning experiences, and strategy in assessing students' writing. After coding the fieldnotes in each round of data collection, the next step was writing *summary*. Each summary contains a list of data that could not be captured in the field work as well as those that need more in-depth investigation, and also

those that would be collected in the next field work. To facilitate the finding of *patterns* of the strategies employed by the English teachers in three model schools in teaching writing, the researcher created *matrices*. Through matrices, the teachers' attempts in designing learning experiences and assessment techniques are expected to be identified. The next step was drawing a conclusion on the basis of the patterns emerging from the data. The first conclusion was still tentative and verification was done as long as the process of data collection.

The attainment of trusted data and finding in this study is elaborated in the discussion of *credibility*, *transferability*, *dependability*, and *confirmability*. Through these discussions, the users of this study will obtain detailed information concerning the procedures to be taken to ensure the status of trusted findings. To enhance credibility, this study applies the techniques of spending a great deal of time in the field, data triangulation, peer debriefing, and member check. Transferability in the present study is established by way of explicit descriptions of the contexts of the study, such as the status of the researcher, the choice of the research subjects, the social situations and conditions, and the methods of data collection and analysis. Dependability or reliability refers to the preciseness or closeness of judgment (made by the researchers) in representing the true information provided by the research subjects [15]. For obtaining the closeness of judgment, several attempts to be made in the present study are: (1) preparing the interview and observation, (2) scheduling the time and place for the interview and observation, (3) arranging comfortable time and place, (4) obtaining information over a period of time is another strategy to obtain the true information from the research subjects, (5) arranging the best conducive atmosphere to analyze the results of interview and observation. The technique employed to determine confirmability is '*inquiry audit*' technique. It is meant to ensure that the research product is supported by needed data. In the present study, inquiry audit was conducted by providing the needed documents and detailed descriptions the settings and subjects.

### 3. Research Findings

#### 3.1 Approach in Teaching Writing

Through learning experiences designed by three English teachers, it can be concluded that the teaching of writing employed by the English teachers at three high schools modeling the competence based curriculum is categorized as the product-based approach of writing instruction. It is characterized by the linear model of instruction in which learners do not receive adequate time and opportunities to produce the final product of writing through revising process. Besides, the students' product of writing is expected to: (1) meet certain prescribed English rhetorical style, (2) reflect accurate grammar, (3) be well-organized [16]. The teachers are influenced by the linear view of writing pedagogy viewing writing as a linear process of finding ideas, drafting, and finished composition.

Learning experiences designed by the English teachers at three high schools are summarized in Tables 3.1.1, 3.1.2, and 3.1.3. In Table 3.1.1, it can be identified that Teacher 1 always begins pre-writing activities by asking students to collect information/data related to the writing tasks. To gather information for carrying out the writing tasks, Teacher 1 used the techniques of questioning, observation, interview, and reflection. Asking students' about their elementary education, asking students to observe pictures, to interview a friend, and to reflect on their conditions are

the examples of pre-writing activities designed by T1. Having gathered the ideas to be written, then students are asked to write those ideas in the forms of writing. Feedback is given from the samples of students' writing.

**Table 3.1.1 Learning Experiences Designed by Teacher 1**

Learning Experiences Designed by Teacher 1			
<i>Writing task 1</i> writing a story of education	<i>Writing task 2</i> writing a story based on picture series	<i>Writing task 3</i> writing a family of a classmate	<i>Writing task 4</i> writing a letter to parents
1. ask questions to mould ideas	1. ask students to observe the picture-in-series given	1. ask students to interview friends about their family	1. ask students to reflect on their conditions
2. asks students to write everything about their education	2. ask students to write everything they know about the picture series	2. ask students to note information about their friend's family	2. ask students to plan the information they are going to write
3. ask students to write their educational stories	3. ask students to match the picture-in-series with the jumbled sentences representing each picture	3. ask students to write description of their friend's family	3. ask students to write letter
4. collect students' writing	4. give feedback to the samples of students' writing	4. give feedback to the samples of students' writing	4. give feedback to samples of students' writing
5. give feedback to samples of students' writing.			

(Source: interview and observational data)

Similar to Teacher 1, in designing writing tasks, Teacher 2 also frames the design of teaching writing by adopting the conventional procedure, i.e. prewriting stage, drafting stage, and feedback stage. The conventional procedure is characterized by its linear process of writing. Table 3.2 summarizes learning experiences designed by Teacher 2.

Table 3.1.3 describes the fact that in designing learning experiences. Teacher 3 is also influenced by the linear view of composing process. Due to this, learning activities are formatted in three stages (i.e. prewriting stage, drafting/writing stage, and publishing stage). In prewriting stage, Teacher 3 activated students' background knowledge through picture and model text and sharing ideas. In writing a message, the teacher used the picture of high school building as a stimuli; in discussing simple past tense the teacher asked students to observe the texts; in discussing procedural texts the teacher asked students to observe the language and organizational features of the model text. Having activated students' background knowledge, students were instructed to write, and collect the finished composition.

**Table 3.1.2 Learning Experiences Designed by Teacher 2**

Learning Experiences Designed by Teacher 2			
writing answers of the comprehension questions	writing a paragraph based on the picture	writing differences via pictures of two families	writing a short paragraph on staying healthy
1. The teacher reads the comprehension questions of the reading text	1. Ask students to observe the pictures about the unordered rubbish.	1. Ask students to work in a pair	1. Ask students to mention several ways to stay healthy
2. The students write the answers	2. Ask students to comment on the picture given about the unordered rubbish	2. Ask them to observe two pictures of different family	2. Write students' answers on the white-board
3. Correct the answers together	3. Ask students to write a descriptive paragraph based on the pictures given.	3. Ask them to comment on the two pictures given	3. Write a short paragraph based on the ideas written on the whiteboard
	4. Correct together samples of the students' writing	4. Ask them to write differences of two pictures	4. Collect students' writing
		5. Ask them to present in front of the class.	5. Assess them using a scoring guide.
		6. Correct samples of students' writing	

(Source: interview and observational data)

**Table 3.1.3 Learning Experiences Designed by Teacher 3**

Learning Experiences Designed by Teacher 3			
Writing English sentences in the simple past tense	writing a message from the simple pictures	telling a family habit	writing a procedural paragraph
1. ask students to bring the available materials from home	1. ask the students to observe the pictures of SMU 7 building	1. listen to students' responses on the obligation of wearing a helmet	1. read sample of the procedural text from the Jakarta Post
2. give short illustration by telling past experience	2. ask the students to give comments	2. talk about the kinds of helmet	2. identify the verbs/language features of the text
3. ask the students to observe the patterns of the simple past tense from the materials brought	3. ask the students to make a framework	3. share the habit in wearing a helmet of each family	3. ask the students to write any recipe of their own choice.

4. ask the students to write 5 sentences of their own in the simple past tense	4. ask the students to write a message from the pictures	4. ask students to write a habit of wearing helmet of each family	4. correct samples of students' writing
5. correct together sentences produced by the students	5. correct samples of students' writing	5. correct samples of students' writing	

---

(Source: interview and observational data)

On the basis of learning experiences designed by the teachers as shown in Figure 4.1, it is concluded that the teachers in the model schools still could not design learning experiences that are appropriate with the targeted writing tasks they designed.

### **3.2 Writing Assessment**

In relation to the writing assessment, Table 3.2.1, 3.2.2, and 3.2.3 summarize the teachers' assessment strategies. Table 3.2.1 shows that in assessing students' writing performance Teacher 1 only assessed students' finished composition. Moreover, he did not correct all the compositions rather took only four to five samples of students' compositions. The sentences that are not grammatically correct in the sample compositions were discussed together in class. From samples of ungrammatically correct sentences, the students are expected to be able to produce grammatically correct sentences when they are assigned to write a composition. In short, correction on samples of students' composition serves as feedback in the form of whole-class feedback. In this case, the teacher did not provide individual feedback.

In addition to assessing the product (composition), Teacher 1 consistently gave formative written test at the end of each unit. The formative test materials consist of the four language skills (listening, reading, speaking, writing). In each formative test, speaking was tested indirectly, i.e. by way of asking students to apply knowledge of language forms in the contexts of dialogue. The writing test was also given indirectly because in the test tasks students were not assigned to do real writing rather to reorder the jumbled sentences to form a paragraph or to choose the correct forms of language from the available options. The results of formative test were used to classify students having achieved the basic competence of writing and those who have not yet achieved the basic competence of writing.

In summary, Teacher 1 consistently assesses students' product for the purpose of providing feedback. For measuring the students' attainment of basic competence in writing, the Teacher 1 consistently gave formative test at the end of each unit. The result of the test is used to categorize students having mastered the basic competence and those having not mastered the basic competence.

Table 3.2.1 revealed that in assessing students' writing performance Teacher 2 assessed students' writing tasks. As done by Teacher 1, in giving feedback, Teacher 2 did not correct all compositions but took only samples of



students' compositions. In the first three writing tasks, correction was focused on language errors found in the sample compositions, in the last writing tasks Teacher 2 used a holistic rubric to score the composition. In short, corrections on samples of students' composition serves as the whole-class feedback instead of individual feedback.

**Table 3.2.1 Assessment of Writing by Teacher 1**

Assessment Writing Activities by Teacher 1			
Writing a story about education	Writing a story based on the picture series	Writing a family of a classmate	Writing a letter to parents
1. Correct samples of students' writing	1. Correct samples of students' writing	1. Correct samples of students' writing	1. Correct samples of students' writing
2. Discuss them together	2. Discuss them together	2. Discuss them together	2. Discuss them together
3. Correct sentences having grammatical errors	3. Correct sentences having grammatical errors	3. Correct sentences having grammatical errors	3. Correct sentences having grammatical errors
4. No revision activities	4. No revision activities	4. No revision activities	4. No revision activities
5. Give writing test at the end of this theme	5. Give writing test at the end of this theme	5. Give writing test at the end of this theme	5. Give writing test at the end of this theme

(Source: interview and observational data)

In addition to assessing the product (composition), Teacher 2 also consistently gave formative written test at the end of each unit. The formative test materials consist of the four language skills (listening, reading, speaking, writing). In each formative test, speaking was tested indirectly, i.e. by way of asking students to apply knowledge of language forms in the contexts of dialogue. Some of the writing tests were also given indirectly because in the test tasks students were not assigned to do real writing rather they were assigned to reorder the jumbled sentences to form a paragraph or to choose the correct forms of language from the available options. The results of formative test were used to classify students having achieved the basic competence of writing and those who have not yet achieved the basic competence of writing.

In summary, Teacher 2 also assesses the product of writing intended to provide feedback. For measuring the attainment of basic competence in writing, Teacher 2 also consistently gave formative test at the end of each unit. It is the paper-pencil test designed to measure four language skills. In this case, speaking is tested indirectly through the objective test in multiple choice and completion formats. Apart from that, some writing skill is also tested indirectly in the formative test. Of the four formative tests, composition task was given once at the end of unit 3. From the result of the test, it can be identified students who have mastered the basic competence and those who have not mastered the basic competence.

Table 3.2.3 reveals that in assessing students' writing performance Teacher 3 consistently assessed students' writing tasks for giving feedback. In correcting writing tasks, Teacher 3 used the strategies of the whole-class correction,

teacher-self correction on all students' writing tasks, and teacher-self correction on the samples of students' writing tasks. In four writing tasks, it is found that whole-class correction was done by the teacher in correcting task 1 (writing English sentences), teacher-self correction on all writing tasks was done in correcting task 2 (picture writing), and teacher-self correction on samples of students' composition was done in correcting task 3 and 4. According to the teacher, whole-class correction is done when the task is supposed to be easy, teacher-self correction on all writing tasks is conducted when he needs to know area of difficulties of each student, and self-correction on samples of students' writing is done having recognized areas of students' difficulties in writing.

**Table 3.2.3 Assessment of Writing by Teacher 2**

Assessment Writing Activities by Teacher 2			
writing comprehension questions of the text read the teacher	writing a paragraph based on the picture about unordered 'rubbish'	writing differences of the two families from the pictures given	writing a short paragraph on 'how to stay healthy'
1. Ask 3 students to read the answers	1. Correct samples of students' writing	1. Correct samples of students' writing	1. Correct samples of students' writing
2. Give other students to decide the correct answers.	2. Discuss them together	2. Correction was focused only on the language (common errors) rather than on contents or organization.	2. Use holistic rubric as scoring guide
3. Write the best answers on the whiteboard.	3. Correct sentences having grammatical errors	3. There was no special time to rewrite the composition.	3. Discuss the results of corrections with the class as feedback
4. Ask students to retell the answers using their own words.	4. No revision activities	4. Formative test at the end of this unit	4. No revision activities
5. Improve or correct their own answers.	5. Give writing test at the end of this theme		5. Give formative test at the end of this theme
6. Formative test at the end of this unit			

(Source: interview and observational data)

Apart from assessing the product, Teacher 3 consistently gave formative written test at the end of each unit. The formative test materials should have consisted of the four language skills (listening, reading, speaking, writing). In each formative test, speaking was tested indirectly, i.e. by way of asking students to apply knowledge of language forms in the contexts of dialogue. Considering much time spent to correct students' compositions, most of writing tests are given indirectly, such as reordering the jumbled sentences to form a paragraph or to choose the correct language forms from the multiple choice task or provide the correct language forms through gap-filling task. In the four formative test, for example, the teacher tested only one composition task at the end of formative test four. The results of formative test were used to classify students having achieved the basic competence of writing and those who have not yet achieved the basic competence of writing.

**Table 3.2.3 Assessment of Writing by Teacher 3**

## Assessment Writing Activities by Teacher 3

Writing a story about education	Writing a short message from the building of SMU 7 Jakarta picture	Telling a habit of the students' family in wearing helmet	Writing a procedural paragraph
1. Remind the students to check errors	1. Correct all students' writing	1. correct samples students' writing	1.correct all students' writing
2. Ask the students to revise them if necessary	2. Correct sentence errors and contents.	2. aspects to be corrected are sentence structure and contents.	2. aspects to be corrected are sentence structure and contents.
3. Correct together the English sentences through the answer key	3. Return the results of correction containing comments and notes	3. return the results of correction containing comments and notes	3. return the results of correction containing comments and notes
4. Return the results of correction to the students	4. Group the scores into good, average, bad	4. group the scores into good, average, bad	4. group the scores into good, average, bad
5. Give formative test at the end of the unit	5. Give formative test at the end of the unit	5. Give formative test at the end of the unit	5. Give formative test at the end of the unit

(Source: interview and observational data)

In summary, Teacher 3 also consistently assesses the product of writing intended to provide feedback as done by Teacher 1 and Teacher 2. For measuring the attainment of basic competence in writing, Teacher 2 also consistently conducted formative test at the end of each unit. It is the paper-pencil test designed to measure four language skills. In this test, speaking is tested indirectly through the objective test in multiple choice and completion formats. Not different from speaking test, in the formative test writing is also tested indirectly. In the test tasks, students were asked to arrange jumbles sentences to form a paragraph, to match pictures and texts, and to complete a gap with suitable words. Of the four formative tests given, direct writing test (i.e. composition task) is only given at the end of unit 4. From the result of the test, the teacher can identify students having mastered the basic competence and those who have not mastered the basic competence.

In the whole, it can be inferred that the teachers from three schools trying out the competence-based curriculum only used product assessment to provide feedback and to monitor students' progress in writing skill. Apart from that, to measure whether or not the competence-based curriculum has already been achieved, the teachers from three schools consistently held formative test at the end of each unit. Lastly, it can be stated that there is a similarity in the way teachers conducted writing assessment.

On the basis of the teachers' use of writing assessment, it is revealed that the teachers are not yet familiar with the other types of writing assessment. In reference to this, it is concluded that the teachers are not able to conduct writing assessment correctly.

#### **4. Discussion**

In the findings it is revealed that learning experiences designed and applied by three English teachers reflect the application of product-based approach in teaching writing which emphasizes on the formation of language in the beginning level. The pattern of activities follows the step of assigning students to write, asking students to do the assignment, and assessing the products of assignments. This pattern emerges entirely in the controlled writing activities, guiding writing activities, and semi-free writing activities.

The above findings support the theory of product-based approach in teaching writing as proposed by Bowen, the authors in [17,5,17] suggest that in a good writing class there must be a place for some kinds of controlled or guided and some free writing activities at every level. However, the teacher has to select and plan courses according to the course objectives, students' interest, and what seems to be the best for the students. In addition to this, Paulston and Bruder[5] also suggest that for the beginning level, the correct language form of sentences and their punctuation become the teaching focuses, while rudimentary principles of organization are also learned; at intermediate and advanced levels, they concentrate on the organization, i.e. development of ideas, but students still need to work on sentence level language skills; on all levels students should have a chance to occasionally write free compositions, and this practice should become increasingly frequent on the intermediate and advanced levels.

The adoption of product approach in teaching writing can be discussed as follows. First, the indicators of basic competence of writing stated in the competence based curriculum explicitly direct the teachers to apply the product-based approach in teaching writing. For example, in the basic competence of 'writing English sentence and writing messages', the performance indicators are : (1) writing free sentences through dictation, (2) writing sentences in a paragraph through dictation, (3) writing messages through pictures. These all indicate that the writing materials are directed towards the formation of language accuracy for the beginning. Second, the teachers may only be familiar with the conventional model of teaching writing. It is proved by the fact that although some writing tasks designed by the teachers asked students to write one-paragraph composition or through guided techniques, in fact the learning activities designed by the teachers reflect the use of product approach in teaching writing with the patterns of giving assignments, writing, and assessing the product of assignments.

Besides the product approach, the teachers can employ another approach in teaching writing. As reviewed previously, process approach emphasizes on the formation of fluency instead of accuracy. It is a new approach in teaching writing required to be understood by senior high school English teachers. Considering its importance, the competence based curriculum published by the Directorate General of Basic and Middle Education recommends the English teachers to adopt the process approach in teaching writing.

In the process approach, writing process is viewed as a messy process, i.e. a process of making meaning through the act prewriting, drafting, and revising [6,7]. In prewriting, the students discover and explore what they want to write about. In drafting, they create more than one rough draft of what they want to say about the topic. In revising, students craft their writing by focusing on contents and organization by adding, deleting, and moving sections, and

polishing their writing to produce a final version. Another writer, Tompkins [18] adds two other writing processes: editing and publishing. In editing, students proofread to identify and correct mechanics of writing. Lastly, in publishing students make final copies of their compositions.

The solely use of product approach in teaching writing may have some impacts on students' writing skill as both the grammatical accuracy and fluency are equally important in the formation of writing skill, which include language skills and the skills in organizing ideas. The writing skill, thus, cannot be attained by way of improving language accuracy in the first place rather they must be facilitated together.

As a compromise, balancing product and process in the teaching of writing is much recommended by ESL educators. Brown [15], for example, proposed eight principles to be considered in designing writing techniques: (1) incorporate practice of good writers, (2) balance process and product, (3) account for cultural/literary background, (4) connect reading and writing, (4) provide as much authentic writing as possible, (5) frame the techniques in terms of prewriting, drafting and revising stages, (6) offer techniques that are as interactive as possible, (7) apply methods of responding to and correcting students' writing, and (8) instruct students on the rhetorical and formal conventions of writing.

The ideas above indicate that the teachers need to think about weaknesses and strengths concerning the techniques of teaching writing available from the literature. Teachers need to think about the characteristics of writing tasks and their students' cognitive and linguistic levels in selecting the techniques of teaching writing. In essence, the two techniques under the two approaches in teaching writing should not be viewed as mutually exclusively. Instead, the teachers need to view them as a continuum, ranging from process up to the product. So, before deciding the kinds of writing techniques to be used, there should be an analysis of writing objectives as well as the cognitive and linguistic levels of their students.

In the finding, it is revealed that feedback was given to the product of students' writing tasks, i.e. English sentences, messages, and compositions written by the students. Feedback is commonly given to samples of students' work instead of the total students' work. Aspects to be assessed are entirely related to the language aspects (mechanics of writing and ungrammatically correct sentences) rather than the rhetorical aspect. Apart from monitoring students' progress in writing, the teachers also assess students' writing performance at the end of each unit through an integrated formative test. The scores of writing in the test are used to indicate whether or not students have attained the basic competence of writing. In assessing students' writing performance, the English teachers do not use a scoring guide which can be in the forms of holistic or analytic rubrics.

The use of product assessment by the teachers is logical because the teachers applied the product approach in teaching writing. In the product approach, the teachers do not monitor the process students use as they write, rather the focus is on the assessment on the quality of students' finished product. Process assessment examines what students do as they write, the strategies they use, and the decisions they make as writers [18]. Three measures of process assessment are writing process checklist, student-teacher assessment conferences, and self-assessment by

students. Both students and teachers can use these measures to keep track of completed work, to reflect on students' growth as writers, and for grading.

In assessing the students' writing performance, it appears that the teachers did not use the scoring guide. These scoring activities may produce biased scores, which may not represent students' true ability. The absence of scoring guide means that 'there is no criteria or descriptors used to categorize very good work, good work, average work, poor work, and very poor work'. Without scoring guide, different raters may give scores which possibly can be far different from one another. Consequently, the scoring results could not be used as standard to separate students into a group who have already attained and those who have not attained the basic competence of writing.

The absence in using a scoring guide implies that the teachers ignore the concepts of validity and reliability as the characteristics of a good instrument. This could happen for several reasons. First, in the training of competence based curriculum a discussion on the use of assessment procedures may not be discussed deeply. As a result the teachers did not have any ideas about the kinds of scoring rubrics used to assess students' writing performance. In assessing students' writing performance, the use of scoring rubrics are absolutely important in order to produce the reliable scores. Second, the teachers' professional attitudes and behaviors may be questionable with the assumption that during their pre-service training education they have already learned how to construct and score English language test.

With a rapid development of assessment procedures, it is expected that the teachers understand deeply the system of evaluation used in the competence based curriculum. There are several attempts that need to be done concerning the improvement of the English teachers' capabilities in conducting assessment procedures in the competence-based curriculum. First, in the training of competence based curriculum, the issue of assessment techniques must be discussed. The teachers need to understand them by experimenting it themselves by developing instrument related to the basic competencies of writing to be achieved. Second, the results of the instrument development must be tried out in the teaching of writing in English subject, and there should be monitoring on the implementation stage.

The effectiveness of approach and assessment in writing employed by the teachers is justified by the techniques in teaching writing, and the techniques in assessing writing work as stated in the following. First, learning experiences designed and applied by three English teachers reflect the application of product approach in teaching writing emphasizing on the formation of language accuracy. In the adoption of techniques in teaching writing, it is recommended that the teachers use a variety of techniques in the process approach and product approach. A decision to use a particular technique depends on the objectives of writing tasks and the level of linguistic background of the students. On the basis of it, it can be concluded that the adoption of product approach in teaching writing by the teachers for all types of writing tasks seem to be ineffective as the writing tasks that assign students to write texts is better approached using the techniques in the process approach in teaching writing.

Lastly, related to the assessment, it is revealed that the teachers assessed the product (writing tasks) through samples of writing. Aspects to be assessed are the language aspects, i.e. mechanics of writing and ungrammatically

correct sentences. Apart from that, the teachers also assess students' writing performance at the end of each unit through an integrated formative test. Assessment on one aspect of writing seems to be imbalanced because writing skill is not only indicated by the aspect of language but also the aspect of organizing ideas. Besides, the absence on the use of assessment guide in assessing students' work may produce invalid and unreliable scores. In this case, the raters will not have a guide in categorizing good from poor writing performance. These imply that English teachers still need more insights on the current issue of language assessment.

Writing personal letters, notes, memos, descriptions, and reporting experiences are some examples of writing materials suitable for developing students' ability to produce texts for different purposes. These types of writing materials in turn affect the choice of teaching and assessment techniques that are effective in the attainment of students' basic competence of writing. In this case, the English teachers are required to understand deeply and able to apply the techniques of teaching writing under the process approach. Through the constructivist model of teaching writing, students are equipped with the strategies applicable for producing English texts for different purposes. Besides, the teachers are required to understand and able to apply different types of writing assessment (i.e. portfolio and self-assessment) for documenting students' progress in writing.

## **5. Conclusions and Suggestions**

Based on the findings and discussion, it is revealed that the teachers applied product-based approach in teaching writing in high schools implementing the competence-based curriculum. In congruence with the approach, teachers also applied product-based assessment in measuring students' competencies in writing.

Related to learning experiences, it is revealed that the learning experiences designed and implemented by the English teachers reflect the application of product-based approach in teaching writing stressing on the formation of language accuracy. The pattern of activities follows the linear model of composing process with the steps of assigning students to write, asking students to do the assignment, and assessing the product of assignments. This pattern emerges entirely in the controlled writing activities, guided writing activities, and semi-free writing activities. By adopting this model, the learners do not write multiple drafting in order to produce the final product of writing through revising process. On the basis of learning experiences designed by the teachers, it is concluded that the teachers could not design learning experiences that are appropriate with the targeted writing tasks they designed.

In line with the adoption of product approach in teaching writing, the assessment techniques employed by the teachers entirely reflect the use of product assessment. This type of assessment provides feedback on the students' written product focusing on the language accuracy, (i.e. mechanics of writing and ungrammatically correct sentences) rather than on the organizational aspect. Feedback is mostly given to samples of students' products by discussing them together in the classroom. Aside from feedback, the teachers also assess students' writing performance at the end of each unit through an integrated formative test. In assessing students' products as well as the writing performance from the test, however, most of the teachers do not use rubrics as the scoring guide. On the

basis of the teachers' use of writing assessment, it is concluded that the teachers are not capable of conducting writing assessment correctly.

For the effectiveness of teaching writing in the context of ELT in high schools, aspects that need to be improved are: (1) the design of writing tasks suggested by the competence based curriculum, (2) the design of constructivist/process approach in teaching writing, and (3) the use of various kinds of assessment procedures in teaching writing.

Apart from understanding the types of tasks, the teachers need to know more about the appropriate writing skills commonly taught for each level of writing development. In earlier stages of language learning, language problems should definitely play a major role in writing instruction, whereas for advanced level, a writing instruction will lay greater stress on rhetorical problems, although it must necessarily include producing the proper language.

Related to techniques in teaching writing, the teachers need to be introduced with the constructivist approach in teaching writing. By understanding the constructivist approach in teaching writing, it is expected that the teachers can select a more appropriate technique by considering the types of writing tasks and the levels of their students' linguistic ability. Principally, the constructivist approach is suitable for developing writing skills that asked students to produce texts. In the constructivist approach, students are exposed with the real process of producing a piece of writing through the recursive process of prewriting, drafting, and revising. Through these activities, students are equipped with the strategies in producing a piece of text.

In using assessment techniques, it is recommended that teachers process assessment focusing on assessing students as writers. Process assessment examines what students do as they write, the strategies they use, and the decisions they make as writers [18]. Three measures of process assessment that need to be introduced to the teachers are writing process checklist, student-teacher assessment conferences, and self-assessment by students. Both students and teachers can use these measures to keep track of completed work, to reflect on students' growth as writers, and for grading. A writing process checklist includes characteristic activities and considerations for each stage of the writing process, from gathering and organizing ideas during prewriting, to publishing compositions in the last stage. Students use the checklist to monitor their movement through the writing process. Similarly, teachers use the checklist as they observe students writing and participating in related activities.

As the present study belongs to descriptive research having a purpose of describing the effectiveness of teaching of writing in the context of ELT in senior high schools in Jember, it is recommended that future researchers (using experimental design) investigate differences in the mastery of writing skill between students who are taught using the conventional model and the constructivist model of teaching writing in high school. By understanding the differences in the effectiveness of these two approaches, the high school English teachers are better informed with the strengths of each approach from the empirical data.



## References:

- [1] M. Canale, and M. Swain “Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing”. *Applied Linguistics* 1 (1):1-47, 1980.
- [2] M. Celce-Murcia and E. Olshtain. *Discourse and Context in Language Teaching. A Guide for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- [3] A. Saukah. *Pengembangan Sistem Penilaian di Bidang Bahasa* (Seminar Paper). Presented in the National Seminar “HIMPUNAN EVALUASI PENDIDIKAN INDONESIA (HEPI), Yogyakarta, 26-27 March, 2004.
- [4] Department of Education and Culture. *Kurikulum Sekolah Menengah Umum. Garis-Garis Besar Program Pengajaran (GBPP). Mata Pelajaran Bahasa Inggris*. Jakarta: Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan, 1993.
- [5] C.B. Paulston and M.N. Bruder. *Teaching English as a Second Language*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1976.
- [6] D. Gorel. *The Purposeful Writer. A Rhetoric with Readings*. Boston: Sage Publications, Inc., 1991.
- [7] L. Ede. *Work in Progress. A Guide to Writing and Revising*. New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1992.
- [8] L. Winer. “Spinach to Chocolate: Changing Awareness and Attitudes in ESL Writing Teachers”. *TESOL Quarterly*, 26 (1): 57-79, 1992.
- [9] J.K Peyton. “Implementing Writing Workshop with ESOL Students: Visions and Realities”. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28 (3): 469-487, 1994.
- [10] B.Y. Cahyono. “Developing fluency in writing through responded thematic writing. Second Language Writing and Rhetoric”. *Research Studies in the Indonesian Context* (52-59). Malang: State University of Malang Press, 2001b.
- [11] B.Y. Cahyono. “Effectiveness of Journal Writing in Supporting Skills in Writing English Essay. Second Language Writing and Rhetoric”. *Research Studies in the Indonesian Context* (44-51). Malang: State University of Malang Press, 2001a.
- [12] R.C. Bogdan, and S.K. Biklen. *Qualitative Research for Education: An Introduction to Theory and Methods* (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.). Needham Heights: Allyn and Bacon, 1993.
- [13] J.R. Fraenkel and N.E. Wallen. *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education*. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1996.

- [14] M.B. Miles and A.M. Huberman. *Qualitative Data Analysis*. (Second edition). London: Sage Publications, Inc., 1994.
- [15] H.D. Brown. *Teaching English by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. New York: Longman, 2001.
- [16] M.A. Latief. Reliability of Language Skills Assessment Results. *Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan*, 8 (3): 214-224. Malang: Percetakan Penerbit Universitas Negeri Malang, 2001.
- [17] J.D. Bowen, H. Madsen & A. Hilferty. *Tesol Techniques and Procedures*. Cambridge: Newbury House Publishers, 1992
- [18] G.E. Tompkins. *Teaching Writing: Balancing Process and Product*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1994.
- [19] G.E. Tompkins. 1992. "Assessing the Processes Students Use as Writers". *Journal of Reading*, 36:3: (244-246).